

Application No.: 10/724,330  
Reply to final Office Action of: April 17, 2008

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the final Office Action dated April 17, 2008. The rejection at issue is 35 U.S.C. Section 112. Claims 17 and 33 are amended to address the Examiner's rejection. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested based on this amendment.

#### ***Rejections Under 112***

In paragraph 2 of the office action, the Examiner rejects claims 17-29, 31-45, 47-48 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner believes that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, with respect to claim 17, the Examiner maintains that independent claim 17 now recites the limitation "in some instances selectively routing the active buyer based on the request data via multiple commercial transaction control systems to communicate with widely distributed vendors with capabilities to route calls between vendors to fulfill a request," for which the Examiner does not support in the text pointed to by the Applicant. Applicant pointed to paragraph 25 as providing support. This paragraph states that "[c]alls may be routed to the next available operator (buyer), for example, in the event appointments scheduled for a particular buyer last longer than contemplated, or another buyer familiar with that line of products may step in and handle the appointment." Applicant submits that the Examiner reads the capabilities of the systems and methods described generally in the specification with the specific example of scheduling appointments. In addition, the Examiner takes the position that only routing between buyers is disclosed. The Examiner indicates that as stated in the previous Office action, there is

Application No.: 10/724,330  
Reply to final Office Action of: April 17, 2008

no description of such selective routing to another vendor after providing identified video and text to the active buyer. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is directed to routing calls to vendors or between vendors to fulfill a request. The claim does not recite that the routing is after providing identified video and text to an active buyer. Nonetheless, the claims at issue are amended to recite that requests from buyers are routed to one or more vendors of widely distributed vendors. That is described throughout the specification, for example, pages 35 on where routing based on vendor qualification and classification is well described.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the claims and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 17, 2008

By: /Reena Kuyper/  
Reena Kuyper  
Registration No. 33,830

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
(310) 247-2860